

PUBLIC HEALTH ALWAYS WORKING FOR A SAFER AND HEALTHIER WASHINGTON

Septic O&M on Marine Shorelines WA State Board of Health, July 14, 2004



Agenda

- What is being asked of the Board
- What is already in RDC Report
- What are the policy drivers
- What is being proposed by DOH
- Policy issues re: environment and mandating renewable O&M permits
- Possible legislative package



Goals

- Familiarity with complex issues
- Exposure to different opinions
- Opportunity to ask questions
- Encourage early participation
- Prepare for November hearing
- Provide guidance if Board chooses



Requests for a further consideration

- RDC minority reports
- Puget Sound Action Team
- Governor Gary Locke
- Congressman Norm Dicks
- State Rep. John Upthegrove
- Pacific Coast Shellfish Growers



What's being asked of the Board?

- Stronger planning requirements (deadline, state review, adoption)
- Address environmental issues (i.e., nitrogen in marine waters)
- Renewable and revocable permits for marine counties



What are the PH policy drivers?

- Microbial contamination through drinking water, shellfish and bathing
 - Fecal coliform concentration primary reason for closures and restrictions [EPA Voluntary Guidelines]
- Nitrogen is a human health concern only if it contaminates drinking water (not marine)



What are non-PH policy drivers?

- Environmental: Declining water quality (especially Hood Canal)
- Economic: Shellfish industry
 - -22 of 96 commercial shellfish growing areas "threatened" (12 in 1997)
 - WA is the leading producer of farmed oysters, clams and mussels



Brad Ack, Director
Puget Sound Action Team
Marine Water Quality Issues
Oxygen Depletion in Puget Sound



What is already in the RDC report?

 Planning requirements, minimum lot size, nitrogen standard, etc...

Maryanne Guichard, Director Environmental Health & Safety Department of Health



What is being proposed by DOH?

Maryanne Guichard



Addressing environmental issues

- Limits on Board authority
- Nuisances
- Concurrent and conflicting authorities



Board's environmental authority

 RCW 43.20.050(2)(b): "...to protect public health, the state board of health shall... [a]dopt rules and standards for prevention, control, and abatement of health hazards and nuisances related to the disposal of wastes, solid and liquid, including but not limited to sewage [and] adopt standards and procedures governing the ... operation of sewage...facilities"



Board environmental authority

- Basic authority to protect public health
- Specific authority for operation requirements
- For "health hazards and nuisances"
 - Nuisance is a condition or use of the property that interferes with the ability of others to enjoy their property or properties



Concurrent local authority

- Constitutional and statutory PH authority for local government
- Specific LHJ statutory authority consider the environment as well as public health for alternative systems



1971 Shoreline Management Act

- Limit "adverse effects to the public health...
 the waters of the state and their aquatic life."
- Primarily responsibility of local government
- Specifies DOE as lead state agency
- Broad rule making authority for DOE
- Local septic authority explicit in DOE WACs
- Later and more specific than 43.20.050



Operation and Maintenance Permits

- Limited operating permits issued to owner
- Must be renewed
- Can only be renewed if owner provides proof system is in compliance with the terms and the conditions of the permit.



Terms and conditions of permits

- Regular and timely O&M performed
 - Inspection by LHJ, or
 - Inspection by licensed contractor, or
 - Contract with inspection service or utility district



- Legal issues
- Resource issues
- Political issues
- Enforcement/Accountability issues



- Does requiring access diminish property?
 - Denying access is a right of ownership
 - Is it a taking?
- No administrative warrants unless HO can show probable cause (RCW 70.118.030)
- Court decision that owners don't have to cooperate with inspections & inventories
- Challenges to maintenance easements



- Environmental health programs are funded by fees
 - No infrastructure dollars (databases, etc.)
 - Fees don't often reflect the true costs
- OSS inventories are incomplete, unreliable
- Need money for repairs (revolving fund)
- Capacity of local env. health departments



- Availability of trained, licensed O&M contractors
- Desire to honor the RDC process
- Strong property rights focus in parts of WA
- Respect for local authority
- Mandate could cause backlash



- Accountability—what are penalties?
 - -Civil fines?
 - Use restrictions?
 - Attachment to property records?
 - Removal from property?
 - Condemnation?
- Rule making before legislative action



Thurston County Experience

- Countywide O&M permits
- Risk-based management in Henderson Inlet

Art Starry, Environmental Health Director

Thurston County Health Department



Legislative/Interagency Fixes

- POG directive
- Legislative reforms being considered

Brad Ack



Options for the Board (partial list)

- Act on PSAT suggestion (assume risk)
- Narrow O&M requirement to focus on human health and high-risk areas
- Make it more difficult to permit on shorelines w/o waivers and require O&M as mitigation for the waiver
- Accept DOH changes as most we can do and await legislative "fixes"
 - Strong Board support for legislation

PUBLIC HEALTH ALWAYS WORKING FOR A SAFER AND HEALTHIER WASHINGTON